

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 17 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 18 to 53.

Support for these claims can be found in the original specification and claims.

Applicant has also amended the specification to correct two obvious errors.

First, an oxygen was unintentionally left off both formula (I) on page 4 and formula (I') on page 5 to read "-CO-A-CO-O-(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>n</sub>-" instead of the intended "-CO-A-CO-O-(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>n</sub>-. Second, the sodium dimethyl sulphonate recited in Example 1 was unintentionally transcribed as such instead of the intended "sodium dimethyl-isophthalate-5 sulphonate." By the present amendment, Applicant seeks to remedy these mistakes and more precisely describe the invention.

The error in formulas (I) and (I') is apparent from the teachings of the present specification, which describes these compounds as comprising dicarboxylate units. See, e.g., page 4, line 23 and page 28, line 2. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is not possible to obtain dicarboxylate units absent the missing oxygen. Further, formula (I) is correctly written at page 28, line 3, thus demonstrating further that the errors on pages 4 and 5 are merely typographical.

With respect to the error in Example 1, the mistaken transcription of the term "sodium dimethyl isophthalate-5 sulphonate" is apparent from the positioning of the sulpho group of sulpho 1,3-phenylene and from the disclosure on page 9, lines 3-4,

of the preferred compound "sodium dimethyl 5-oxysulphonylisophthalate." If one looks at the chemical structure of this compound, it is clear that the substituent on the isophthalate ring in the 5-position is in fact sodium dimethyl sulphonate. This accounts for the statement on page 6, lines 2-6, which states that A can preferably be a sodium sulphonate.

Accordingly, both the mistakes and the solutions are obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Courts have held that it is not new matter to make a correction to the specification if one skilled in the art would not only appreciate the existence of an error in the specification, but what the error is. See *In re Oda*, 170 U.S.P.Q. 268, 270 (1971) (stating "when the nature of this error is known it is also known how to correct it"). Applicant submits that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that sodium dimethyl sulphonate was not correctly recited and that without the oxygen, formula (I) and formula (I') could not contain dicarboxylate units. Applicant further submits that one skilled in the art would also know how to correct the obvious errors, as Applicant has done by the above amendment.

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT,  
& DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005  
202-408-4000



**Attorney Docket No. 05725.0473-00**  
**National Stage of International Application No. PCT/FR98/00423**

Thus, no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims or to the specification. Applicant now awaits an action on the merits.

Please charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916 if necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: Thalia V. Warnement  
Thalia V. Warnement  
Reg. No. 39,064

Dated: September 13, 1999

06-0916-00000000

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT,  
& DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005  
202-408-4000